



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/193,564	11/17/1998	JAY PAUL DRUMMOND	D1077+6	2181
28995	7590	06/19/2008		
RALPH E. JOCKE walker & jocke LPA 231 SOUTH BROADWAY MEDINA, OH 44256				
EXAMINER				
ELISCA, PIERRE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JAY PAUL DRUMMOND, DALE BLACKSON,
BOB A. CICHON, JOSEPH C. ESS, MARK A. MOALES,
DAVID W. WEIS, MARK D. SMITH, and JAMES CHURCH

Appeal 2008-1626
Application 09/193,564
Technology Center 3600

Decided: June 19, 2008

Before JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO, LANCE LEONARD BARRY, and
HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER REQUIRING ADDITIONAL BRIEFING BY APPELLANTS

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A Patent Examiner rejected claims 1-20. The Appellants appeal therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has the "authority to set reasonable briefing requirements." *Putman v. Dudas*, 539 F.Supp.2d 414, 421 (D.C.C. 2008). Such requirements include instructing an appellant that "no 'prior briefs should be referenced or incorporated' in a subsequent filing." *Id.*

III. ANALYSIS

Here, we previously issued an order remanding the application to the Examiner "to prepare a substitute examiner's answer that explains his rejections *in toto* rather than incorporating the rejections by reference." *Ex parte Drummond*, No. 2003-1621, at 3 (BPAI July 12, 2004). The order ended with instructions for each side. More specifically, we instructed the Examiner as follows: "the application is remanded to the examiner for further action not inconsistent with the views expressed herein. Any subsequent answer submitted by the examiner should be self-contained with respect to all rejections and arguments. No prior answer should be referenced or incorporated therein." *Id.* We likewise instructed the Appellants as follows: "[s]imilarly, any subsequent brief submitted by the appellants should be self-contained with respect to all arguments. No prior brief should be referenced or incorporated therein." *Id.*

Consistent with our instructions, the Examiner filed a substitute Examiner's Answer that was entirely self-contained and did not reference or incorporate his previous filing. The Appellants responded with a *3rd Reply Brief*. Their Brief, however, failed to adhere to our instruction that it "be

self-contained with respect to all arguments" *Drummond*, at 3, and that "[n]o prior brief should be referenced or incorporated therein." *Id.* To the contrary, the Appellants did just that. More specifically, they referenced the arguments made in three prior briefs, viz., "Appellants' Appeal Brief filed January 29, 2002; their Reply Brief filed May 9, 2002; and their Reply Brief filed January 28, 2003" (3rd Reply Br. 6), incorporating them by reference. (*Id.*)

IV. ORDER

After remanding the appeal to the Examiner to prepare a substitute examiner's answer that explains his rejections *in toto* rather than incorporating the rejections by reference, "[i]t would be unfair . . . to reward [the Appellants] for [their] mistake." *Putman*, 539 F.Supp.2d at 421. Instead, we order the Appellants to furnish a substitute brief that is self-contained with respect to all arguments. The substitute brief must repeat every argument that the Appellants want considered. Any argument made in their earlier briefs not so repeated will be waived. No prior briefs should be referenced or incorporated therein.

V. CONCLUSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(d), we give the Appellants a non-extendable time period of thirty days within which to respond to this order. Failure to comply with the order within that time will result in the *sua sponte* dismissal of this appeal. 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(d).

ORDERED

tdl/ce

RALPH E. JOCKE
WALKER & JOCKE LPA
231 SOUTH BROADWAY
MEDINA OH 44256